DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 542 95 CE 005 033

AUTHOR Pucinski, Roman
TITLE Everything You Always Wanted to Know About the National Legislature But...Career and Vocational Education Professional Development Report No. 10.
INSTITUTION North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh. Center for Occupational Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-02-2591
PUB DATE 73
GRANT OEG-0-72-4676(725)
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Educational Change; Educational Legislation; Federal Government; *Government Role; Speeches; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

In the paper, prepared from a recording of his keynote address for a conference on change in vocational education, Congressman Pucinski expresses his intense interest in vocational education and his belief in the democratic process. Education is vital if people are to understand the complex legislative process and the challenges to accepted institutions. This slow, built-in process provides protection against bad legislation. Lack of a national education policy and the development by the executive of rule by guidelines have caused problems for Congress. Through compromise in the legislative system, good programs do emerge, such as vocational education, toward which the Congress is very favorable. Development of this practical educational approach can help save the educational system. In dealing with our growing population and economy, and with the need to change occupations within a lifetime, career education, in combination with vocational education, is vital. Occupational education can then continue at the postsecondary level. There is a need to overcome the stigma of vocational education as a place for nonachievers. Other challenges and opportunities are especially present in the areas of distributive education, agriculture, home economics, and paramedicine. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113512

EVERYTHING YOU ALWAYS WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT THE NATIONAL LEGISLATURE BUT . . .

Roman Pucinski

Alderman, City of Chicago
Former Member, U. S. House of Representatives

****

The presentation included herein was given pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

****

Career and Vocational Education Professional
Development Report No. 10

CENTER FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
North Carolina State University at Raleigh

1973

Project No. 02-2591
Grant No. OEG-0-72-4676(725)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 005 033

THE CENTER

John K. Coster, Director

The Center for Occupational Education at North Carolina State University at Raleigh is a research and development center established in 1965 under the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The Center has been established as an integral unit within the School of Education at North Carolina State University, and its major programs are supported by contracts with the National Institute of Education. The Center has as its mission the provision—through research, development, and related activities—of a continuing contribution to the improvement of occupational education. The major research and development programs of the Center focus on the relationship of occupational education to its context or environment. The frame of reference for occupational education includes its relationship to regional economy, politics, and the employment or work environment. In addition to its primary programs, the Center also maintains a Division of Special Service Projects which provides the capability for flexible action within the Center's overall mission. Funding for these projects is not maintained through the Center's federal grant, but rather negotiated on a project-by-project basis with contracting agencies.

CAREER AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERIES

Mollie W. Shook, Series Editor

This series is published by the Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, as a service of the Career Education Branch, Paul A. Manchak, Chief, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, U. S. Office of Education.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For additional information regarding the Center, please write to:

Dr. John K. Coster, Director
Center for Occupational Education
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
P. O. Box 5096
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

3/4

PREFACE

If there is any group that is influencing the direction of American education, it is a segment of the United States Congress who have expressed interest in and directed their attention to the problems of American education, including vocational education. And on any list of the leaders or former leaders of Congress who have made their mark on education, the name of Roman Pucinski would be included. Not only has Congressman Pucinski advocated educational reform, but he has not been afraid to stand up and be counted for vocational education for all Americans. Few if any members of the American Vocational Association can rival him for forthright statements in support of vocational education. He is and has been a friend in court.

Congressman Pucinski's track record in vocational education made him an ideal choice to keynote a conference on change in vocational education. This paper, which Dr. Joseph R. Clary, Executive Director of the North Carolina State Advisory Council, declared ". . . should be published by the Center for Occupational Education and disseminated widely," was prepared from a recording of Congressman Pucinski's keynote address for the conference entitled "Leadership for Change" and was presented on Monday, October 1, 1973, at St. Louis, Missouri.

The Center is indebted to Congressman Pucinski for his challenging address and for permission to publish the address, to Dr. Clary for his review, to Mrs. Norma McDonald for transcribing the recording, to Mrs. Betty Randall for typing the manuscript, to Mrs. Sue King for editorial services, and to the entire Center staff for their efforts toward the publication of this paper.

This paper is the 100th publication of the Center for Occupational Education.

John K. Coster
Director

Mollie W. Shook
Conference Director

I am delighted that your respective states have sent you here because there is no question that this is a subje t of intense interest and concern to all of us. Don't let that "strange thing that happened to me on the way to the Senate" disturb you--you know, I have spent some 14 years on the House Education and Labor Committee. I see that Charlie Radcliffe is here, and I am glad that he is going to share with you some of the inner secrets of working with that strange breed of cat in this country called "435 congressmen."

I am pleased to be here because I have an intense interest in vocational education, and I think it is important for all of you to know something about the inner relationships between you as educators and those in government who run and develop the programs. I was intrigued by the title that Dr. Shook assigned to me: Some remarks about everything you have always wanted to know about the national legislature. Mollie said she wanted me to be scintillating, and I said that it's pretty tough to be scintillating about Congress at 9 o'clock in the morning. Be that as it may, I congratulated her on this selection because legislation sooner or later affects the outcome of your work, your plans, your hopes, and your ambitions. Aristotle said some 2400 years ago that democracy is a perversion of constitutional government; Winston Churchill said that democracy is the worst form of government, until you have tried all the others. As I watched our system operate at close range, both as a chairman of an important subcommittee as a member of the House itself for some 14 years, I could sympathize with their opinions. There is no question that democracy is a very difficult process.

It is so difficult that out of 144 nations in this world today, only 31 have some form of democratic process. Presumably, ours is the most advanced. I have said many, many times that if, indeed, democracy is this very difficult process of give and take, we--more than any other nation in the world--must put a very heavy emphasis on education, because the only threat to our country, the only threat to our institutions and our survival as a free society, is a failure of our people to understand this complex system. I am hopeful that between my own remarks and Charlie's remarks you will see how complicated it is, and why it is often so difficult to move things in a meaningful way.

There is no question that Congress is dominated by power blocks, special interests, and executive influence. Never before has the relationship, or inter-relationship, of the three branches of government--the executive, legislative and judiciary--been more severely tested than it is being tested now. The institutions which we accepted over the years are now being challenged by a more militant legislative branch of the government and by the judiciary. So we have such items as impoundment. Is it constitutional and legal for the President--the chief executive--to hold up legislation that has been voted by a majority of the duly-elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States? As you know, impoundment is now being tested, and in many instances the courts are saying that the President cannot impound these funds. Sometimes I hear people say that the country is falling apart, and nothing could be further from the truth. What we are doing is strengthening the system as we test these differences. I don't view the situation in Washington today with any great horror simply

because the three branches of government are testing each other. In my judgment, this is what gives strength to our whole democratic process, even though within that process there are certain complexities. I always chuckle when I see foreign visitors come to Washington because they look invariably at this system of checks and balances and at how legislation originates (all of the tortuous route that it goes through before it lands on the President's desk to be signed into law), and they say, "This system just can't work." I almost want to agree with them because there are times when we do just throw up our hands in frustration and times when administrators of programs just throw up their hands in disgust and frustration, but still--this system DOES work. Perhaps it is within this complexity that we find our greatest strengths, simply because we don't vascillate like the shifting sands with every change of public opinion. Perhaps within the slow, tedious, built-in process which frustrates the will of men and women and drives us right up a wall, we find our greatest degree of security against reasonably bad legislation. One has every right to look at the national legislature and say that it is one hell of a mess, because of the very way that legislation originates. It originates either with an individual member (or group of members) of Congress who asks his committee counsel (as Mr. Quie does--of Charlie Radcliffe--or Carl Perkins does of Jack Jennings) to draw up a bill to do "thus and so," or it originates in the executive branch of government in which case there is always manifested distrust between the executive branch and the legislative branch because when the executive branch writes a bill, it includes little nuances that do not become immediately apparent to the naked eye. They become apparent only after

you have passed the bill, and when you see what the administration DOES with the bill in its rules and regulations, you ask, "Did we pass this?--Is this the bill that we passed?" Unfortunately, it IS the bill that we passed, and it comes back to haunt us. This is why Congress prefers, where possible, to write its own legislation. The Education Committee was fortunate to have men like Jennings and Radcliffe who are very knowledgeable in their subject.

That brings me to the next question in disucssion of this subject--who sets educational policy for the United States? Oddly enough, there is no national educational policy in the United States. Each bill that is passed, whether it is the Vocational Education Act of 1963 or the Smith-Hughes Act, or all the other educational bills, invariably contains a Preamble that tries to set out a certain set of facts that we are trying to correct, but there is no SINGLE, NATIONAL POLICY. There are those who will argue that perhaps that is the way it should be. There is no provision in the Constitution for a policy on how to run education in this country, and there are those who will argue very strongly and convincingly that that is the way it ought to be. Perhaps it is. I once tried to introduce a simple bill, a simple amendment, that would have established a national policy merely guaranteeing every American a free education--an equal education--limited only by the person's own ability and desire to learn. Well, that bill didn't go anyplace, simply because Congress felt that perhaps it is just as well that we do not have a national education policy. I am open on that, but the fact remains that in the absence of that kind of a policy, you must ask yourself, "Who does actually set American policy?" To a great extent, it is determined by

individual congressmen, by the staff of congressional committees, and by the various pressure groups and lobby groups. The AVA, through Lowell Burkett, played a key role in drafting the Amendments in 1968 to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as well as the Vocational Education Act itself--and thank God they were there! They brought to Congress and to the Committee a dimension of expertise that we might not have had otherwise. It was a case of a professional organization playing a key role in setting policies. In the executive branch the cabinet officers and subordinates set foreign policies, and in the executive branch perhaps the greatest single trick (if you want to call it that) to setting American educational policy is the Bureau of the Budget. "Tucked away" in the huge bureaucracy of Washington is a relatively small group of individuals who make up the Bureau of the Budget, and if anyone ever wanted to argue that we have some form of dictatorship in this country, he would probably find it hidden away there because the Bureau of the Budget can dehumanize any single executive, any agency, any group of employees in the federal government--regardless of what their expertise may be on the subject. No matter how carefully researched and planned their recommendations may be for a certain program and certain budget, the Bureau of the Budget (Office of Management and Budget--OMB) has the final say. So, you ask yourself, "How do we then deal--whom do we deal with?" Well, within this whole structure and the complexity of what we call "democracy," we have the individual members of Congress. Frequently, whims and caprices may dictate and dominate their actions, but they are human beings, and while we may not be proud of it, it happens. A Congressman has a group of

people submitting programs from his constituency--a research program on education or some other demonstration project--and for all sorts of reasons the project is turned down. Whatever the reasons may be (and they may be perfectly valid and honest reasons), he will put up a rather good fight with the agency to get the program approved. If the agency insists on turning him down, the Congressman may or may not then try, of course, to retaliate (in many instances they do not, but in many instances they can become very nasty), and they can ask the General Accounting Office to make an investigation of this agency and this poor little bureaucrat who made a perfectly honest and decent judgment. The program won't "fly" even though the local people think it is a great program, and while it has already been duplicated six different times, it is a waste of money. So somebody makes this perfectly honest and valid judgment, but the Congressman, fighting for his constituency, with extremely broad powers, can shake up an agency pretty well, particularly if he happens to be on a committee. I am told that the National Institute of Education spent about three weeks very carefully preparing and rehearsing their testimony before the Appropriations Committee because Edith Green joined the Appropriations Committee. Mrs. Green, who has been a very effective member of Congress, is very pungent in her views and observations and has some very strong views on certain subjects, and when she joined the Appropriations Committee she struck a note of terror in many agencies. So NIE spent three weeks carefully rehearsing all the possible questions Edith Green might pose to them when they came up for their budget. That's the kind of fear that individual members can inspire, but for each of on those there are constructive

members, Al Quie, the ranking minority member of the House Education Committee, has been very imaginative. He was the author of the Occupational Education Act of 1972. Carl Perkins has been very, very imaginative as Chairman of the House Committee. You know, there are certain advantages to being chairman of a committee. They knock the seniority system--the seniority system dictates Congress--but, you know, the seniority system has certain virtues if you are the senior member. Carl Perkins, for instance, has done very well by Kentucky. We on the Committee always kid him that if he gets one more federal project into Kentucky, the whole damned state will collapse because he has so many in there already. There are imaginative, hard-driving congressmen and congresswomen, and as the whole electoral process becomes more open in our society you will find that there are more and more bright people coming into the body politic.

I am hopeful that you as educators planning curriculum in the various occupations will begin looking at politics as an occupation and begin developing some curriculum in your schools which will encourage young Americans to get into politics. Whether you like it or not, it is still one of the highest institutions in our free society. While it is true that many politicians have brought great disrespect on the profession, don't let the ones who make the headlines disturb you, because for every one of those there are thousands of decent people serving in public office in this country, trying to do a good job. What you have, then, is a very complex legislative process trying to work its way through to finding some answers. We finally got the Occupational Education bill through about 3 o'clock in the morning, and we had to "tack it on" to the Higher

Education bill because we were running out of time in that session. We knew that we couldn't get any time scheduled for floor action on this very important bill, so we tacked it on as Title 22, I believe. Throughout that evening, as the manager of that bill I felt like a midwife on a roller coaster, trying to get that bill out of the House and on to the Senate. So it is within this framework that we try to evolve some intelligent educational policy. It does work--not always as we want it to, but it certainly does work--and in my judgment it can work even better if we have people like yourselves who will first of all understand its complex nature. Don't look for easy solutions in the legislative process, and don't be discouraged if you don't find them because sooner or later good ideas will come to the fore. Good programs will emerge. You cannot hope to define perfection. I have learned over 14 years as a member of Congress that if I insisted on perfection in every bill I handled on the floor of the House and if every other of the 434 members of the House similarly insisted on perfection, government would come to a grinding halt. Government is the art of compromise. You do the very best you can, but very often what you think you have passed is completely opposite when it comes out in the form of guidelines or regulations. There is a constant battle between the executive and the legislative branches. The executive doesn't always trust the legislative, and the legislative doesn't always trust the executive. It is to be expected that when Congress passes a law, it cannot cross every "t" and dot every "i." You cannot possibly foresee every single contingency, so, under the Administrative Procedures Act, you give the administrators certain broad powers to promulgate rules and regulations to implement that law.

You delegate to a member of the executive branch of government (a non-elected public official--an appointee) broad powers to set policy, and the Administrative Procedures Act provides that they shall publish these proposed rules in the Federal Register. (I hope that each of you has the opportunity--at least once--to look at the Federal Register because that is where, presumably, everything that happens in the federal government that is of any consequence appears.) Well, theoretically, under the APA everybody is supposed to have 30 days to comment on the proposed rules, but that is not the way it works because the executive branch of government has now developed rule by guidelines. In order to bypass the APA and to avoid the necessity of publishing these rules and regulations in the Register, they now hand out simple guidelines which never see any review by anyone and which cause great consternation in the legislative branch of government and great confusion down the line with people like you who have to work with and administer some of these laws. We have had little success in breaking this "government by guidelines" simply because the administration--any administration, it doesn't make any difference--takes the position that guidelines are a much more effective way of doing things. That is why it is not uncommon for Charlie Radcliffe, Jack Jennings, Roman Pucinski, Al Quie, Carl Perkins, Edith Green, or any member of our committee to look at a bill and say, "This is what we thought we were doing," only to discover that by the time the guidelines have been published and sent down range to all the local agencies, the bill is diametrically opposed to what we were doing.

Within all of this framework, then, we try to set up programs that are important. I would like, if I may, to spend the remainder of my remarks on one such program, because, while the national legislative body is a complex piece of machinery, I feel very confident, after all the years that I have had to deal with this body, that when we have people down range who bring the real meaning of a problem to the Congress, Congress can respond--maybe not as we would have wanted it to, but at least it is a good start. That is why I believe very strongly that here is where the challenge is for you. You, as administrators of education, as people who are interested in vocational education, have to realize that the last quarter of this century belongs to vocational education. Now there is a great sympathy in the Congress for vocational education--and properly so. It is the only program that I can recall in my entire experience that has never had a dissenting vote in either the House or the Senate, on either the Republican or Democratic side, on any measure affecting vocational education. It is the only program that experienced an increase in appropriations voted by the House and the Senate, so Congress itself, with all of its shortcomings, has a profound respect for the vocational educators. What we have to do now is translate that respect into the entire rank of academia. The American public education system is in serious trouble--no question about it--you know this better than I do. I believe very strongly that vocational education, properly presented in all of its aspects, can make the difference between saving the system and having people try to turn to other means. That is why I say with great confidence that the last quarter of this century belongs to the vocational educator. This country is going to a true

trillion-dollar economy. Trying to deal with this enormous country is what has given Congress all of its problems. It is a tremendously big country--203 million people, 435 congressmen, 100 senators, 50 states, all sorts of pockets of special interest throughout the country. Within this framework Congress is trying to get--and we need--your help. You have got to learn how to educate your congressmen on the facts of your community because within the framework of a true trillion-dollar economy, there are going to be enormous educational needs in America. You cannot go to that extreme of prosperity without a nation prepared for that kind of Herculian economic effort. That is why it seems to me that the kind of education we provide American youngsters is going to have a direct bearing on inflation. If you don't have skilled help, if industries are competing against each other for the limited number of skilled workmen, obviously the price of doing business goes up. Here is a great challenge to American education. I say that career education is the key to survival in the 70's, 80's, and 90's. Young people are losing interest and losing faith in our system, and I don't blame them. When they see this complex machinery that we call the Congress of the United States at one level, and then they see the struggle between the executive branch and legislative branch, and then the other complexities of education, a lot of these young people are saying, "The system is not responsive." I maintain that the system CAN be responsive if we have people who understand the role that career education can play in this whole challenge. When you consider the fact that of a work force of 85 million people right now, 22-1/2 million people are under the age of 30, you can see the challenge that we must meet in developing educational programs to meet those needs.

There are some myths, I think, in American education that we have got to overcome. I look upon our challenge as a three-dimensional one. One of the things that worries me (and I hope we are going to discuss this in this conference) is precisely what we are talking about when we say "career education," "vocational education," and "occupational education." I think if I had it to do over again, I would stick with only one--vocational education; but, you know, when we passed the Occupational Education Act we had to play the language game. There were those who said, "You know, vocational education has a bad connotation. There are still people who feel that perhaps vocational education is for the non-achiever, for the kid who is not going anyplace." So, they said we had better find something else, and I must admit to you with a heavy heart that we fell into that trap, and if I turn the clock back and do it over again, I would avoid that trap. We created the Occupational Education Act of 1972. The purpose of the Act is very noble, but I think that by injecting career education, vocational education, and occupational education, we have inadvertently injected some confusion into the whole picture. There are traditional academicians who, even at this late date, cannot understand the relationship of a strong vocational component in American education to the growth of this country. They continue to do whatever they can to somewhat sublimate (and maybe even get rid of) vocational education altogether. We have inadvertently played into their hands because career education, to some people, means something entirely different then it means to other people. I think it is important that we define the precise role of these three elements. I personally view career education as something that every

child ought to have from early childhood. Recently, Captain Kangaroo ran a great series on his television show exposing pre-schoolers to the world of work. What happens to Daddy when he leaves home every morning at 6 o'clock? Where is he? It gives the pre-schooler some idea of the world of work. Now, there are those in the classical academia who say, "This is bad. What are you giving these kids that for?" Well, I personally believe it is important. I believe that career education should be the radix. Career education should mean the exposure of every human being in this country to the world of work--to the opportunities, to the clusters, to some idea of what is available to them as a human being in whatever endeavor they want to go into. We have got to understand that sooner or later every single American, man or woman, has to join the world of work, and I think we have forgotten that in many instances. We are estimating now that by 1975, 55 percent of the mothers of this country will be working mothers. When we reach a true trillion-dollar economy, industry is going to be doing everything it can to attract women. The idea of somehow avoiding the world of work because of one thing or another is a myth. Everybody is sooner or later going to have to join the world of work, so I view career education as an exposure--giving every youngster some idea of what the opportunities are. That is what career education ought to do. However, career education without a vocational component is a fraud on the American people. You cannot expose young people to career education and say, "Here, you have all of these choices," and then when the youngster has whetted his appetite and asked for that kind of education, not have the backup vocational programs to give him the education he seeks.

It seems to me, therefore, that those who try to sublimate vocational education with the new term "career education" are doing the country a great injustice. There has to be a happy marriage between the two. In my judgment, without vocational education, career education is just a myth--a fascade for misleading the American people.

Occupational education, on the other hand, should be primarily for the postsecondary level. The youngster who does not go on to college and wants to get an associate degree at the junior college or community college, postsecondary level should have that opportunity. It seems to me, therefore, that if we can put into perspective career education for everybody and vocational education for all those who want to follow up with area vocational centers (and I think they are one of the greatest things that ever happened in this country), we can then perhaps persuade the young American that this system is indeed responsive and make him realize that he can fit into a very meaningful society. It is interesting, you know, that we hear that young people are not interested in meaningful careers, but every survey that we have seen has shown that the majority of our young people believe that a meaningful career is the most important part of a person's life. Now that sort of offsets the academician who says, "Forget about occupations, forget about vocational education, and forget about careers. Teach and train the TOTAL person, and that TOTAL person will find his level in the world of work." I don't believe that. I believe that young people are far ahead of us, and it disturbs me more than anything else that we are not responsive to what the young people are asking us to do. We recently did a survey in my own district in a college preparatory

high school. We asked the parents of those youngsters and the youngsters themselves whether or not we should be placing a heavy emphasis on career education in THAT school; 97% of the fathers said, "YES," 94% of the mothers said, "YES," and 87% of the students said, "YES." Young people are deeply interested in developing a career/vocational component. Now, we find that in our present structure, 25% of our high school youngsters are enrolled in vocational education programs, while 75% are enrolled in college preparatory courses. One of the things with which we have problems (perhaps serious problems) is "overcoming" in the lower-income groups and in the minority groups--and properly so. For many, many years, vocational education was a kind of repository for the non-achiever. Schools didn't know what else to do with a kid, so they put him in Voc-Ed. If they were going to wash a kid out, they wouldn't just wash him out. They would first give him a short course in Voc-Ed and then they would wash him out, so very often our minority groups felt great hostility toward vocational education because they figured that this was denying their children equal educational opportunities. I think that we are changing that. I remember seeing nice, little old women scrubbing floors in Chicago offices--deep into the night--so they could send their kids to college. Somehow they felt that if the kid did not get a college degree, he was a failure. The heavy emphasis on credentials that we have gone through has played havoc, I think, with our school system, but it seems that now the system is starting to turn around. The citizen is becoming more and more responsive, as is the congressman, simply because the citizen is beginning to realize that vocational

education indeed offers his child greater opportunities, plus the fact, of course, that education itself has become so expensive that many people cannot afford the luxury of going to college for four years. If we can take advantage of these situations, it occurs to me that Congress will be responsive.

One of the things that I think is important in discussing career and vocational education is the change in the structure itself. In the last decade we have developed 5,000 new job skills in America, and we intend to develop another 5,000 in this decade. In many instances these new job skills have not found expression in curriculum, but I think that is going to be cured very shortly. I am impressed with the work that is being done in personnel and curriculum development. When new curricula start finding their way into the school system, when we start offering the more exotic career curriculum opportunities to a broad range of young people, I think you are going to start to see a very substantial turn-around--you're already doing it. I have seen some very exciting developments in curriculum in some of our local communities, and it occurs to me that when those are being offered to young people, enrollments will soar. Chicago Triton College, which has a catalogue that thick of all sorts of exciting careers, has a huge waiting list. You cannot get into Triton College; you have to have political pull and everything else to get in there because everybody wants to get in, simply because they are offering the young students what they want. It seems to me that this is the kind of a situation we have got to develop. Of course, in this changing concept of American technologies, we are going to have to make some

pretty solid assertions. A recent study showed that right now, during the remainder of the 70's, only 17% of our labor force require a college degree. Fifty percent will require training beyond high school, but less than four years of college. Thirty percent of the jobs will require high school-level vocational training, and 3% will require no training at all. It is clear, therefore, that this obsession with credentials must give way to a more practical educational approach. To put it another way, of those heads of households now earning $15,000 a year or more, according to our surveys, 9.8% have only an elementary education, 11.7% have some high school, 30.7% are high school graduates, 16.1% have some college, and 31.7% are college graduates. One-third of those earning $15,000 or more in 1970 had only a high school diploma, and I suspect that most of those are products of vocational education schools.

One of the other challenges that you have got to prepare yourself for is the change in occupations. You grew up--I know I did--thinking that you would prepare yourself for one career and that was that. So you spent your four years in college, training yourself to do one thing. I'll make a little prediction. I am willing to bet that within five years most of you in this room will not be doing what you are doing today. I am willing to bet that most of you in this room will be in some other field--now it may be in some field related to education--it may be a field related to vocational education--but you are going to be doing something substantially different five years from today than you are doing doday. This may be where the heartbeat of this whole subject is: the need for

a career vocational educational complex. We estimate that the average American worker, male or female, is going to change job skills five to nine times in his working lifetime. You are going to have to make education a continuing process from early childhood on. I am not trying to be a "future shock" over here, but these are hard facts, and studies have been made. We are talking now about a task force approach to meeting industrial needs of America. Instead of building huge factories that are to do certain things, they are going to put together a task force to accomplish a mission; and when that mission is completed, they will dissolve the task force and move on to another mission. You are going to see adult education become the key to our survival as a nation in a technological world.

You can see, therefore, that what we are talking about in career and vocational education boggles the imagination. There are enormous opportunities, enormous changes taking place in all of these fields, as we move toward a trillion-dollar economy. You are going to have a new emphasis on distributive education. You cannot move to a trillion dollars' worth of goods and services unless you have a very strong distributive education component. Somebody is going to have to move this economy. Here, perhaps, is a big challenge to the American education institutions. If we are going to give 250-300 million Americans adequate medical health care (as we have to do), there's just no way to train enough doctors to take care of the medical needs of this country. Paramedics become all-important. There are young people graduating from junior colleges with paramedic degrees going into jobs paying $20,000-$25,000 a year, and it is going

to become more pronounced. We never talked about paramedics, or environmental control, in the decade of the 60's. The decade of the 70's is a challenge to survival. Everybody is talking about the energy crises, so we are going into nuclear, solar, and chemical energy and gasification. In the field of agriculture, there are people who are saying, "Well, your ag schools are outdated--only 22% of the American people live on farms, so you can shut down your ag schools." Never have the agricultural schools had a greater challenge than they have now because they are going to have to find the answers to a whole myriad of problems that mankind never even thought about. The answer is going to have to come in oceanography, ocean harvesting, and various other exotic and dynamic fields. So don't be writing any epitaphs and tombstones for ag schools. They say that home economics is still devoted to brownies, cookies, and sewing hemlines in dresses, but the fact of the matter is that the greatest single challenge in American education is going to be in home economics. This is not only because more and more young men are enrolling in it, but because this is the only place where they can find education for this whole business of convenience foods, one of the fastest growing industries in American and in the world. Women themselves have to be trained for dual roles, because if industry starts recruiting women, they are going to have to fulfill their historic role as a mother and homemaker and at the same time be a trained and skilled breadwinner at a time when both are becoming more complicated. We made a study recently to ascertain what it would cost to hire on the open market, with minimum wage and no overtime, the services that the average homemaker provides her family (two

children and husband), and our estimate was $15,600. The significance of that figure is that it shows you how complex the role of homemaker alone is. On top of that, this woman is going to be drafted into industry. She is going to be a breadwinner at the same time she is a homemaker. So those who are writing epitaphs for home ec had better take another look at the opportunities that exist there and see if we (the legislature) don't have a twofold purpose. We have got to, in my judgment, stop this enormous waste of manpower in reports and details, the things that drive the average school administrator up the wall. Federal programs ought not to be so tightly tied in to reporting and everything else that the average school administrator has no time to look at what is happening in the school.

Nobody in this country has a greater challenge than you men and women in this room. I don't know of anyone who has got a tougher assignment than the American educator. I don't know of anyone who is more alone. You put a teacher in a classroom of 30-35 youngsters and close the door, and that teacher is solely in charge of 35 human beings. If that teacher makes a mistake, 35 human beings suffer the consequences for the rest of their lives. I would like for you as administrators to become risk-takers. Carnegie once endowed a fund for risk-takers. They gave an annual award to that American who took the biggest risk, and one year a guy got the award for riding a barrell over Niagara Falls. The next year somebody got the award for walking on wire across Wall Street at 60 stories high or something. Well, we need risk-takers in American education. The American people are ready for it. The American people, in every survey that we have, clearly show they are receptive to career education, vocational education and occupational education, and if

it has to be a shotgun wedding, so be it. I agree with the presidential commission which recommended last year that we take the general educational curriculum and BURY it as deep as we can. Kill it and bury it. They recommended that we have career education and college preparation on a co-equal level. Only when EVERY American youngster is exposed to career education as part of the learning process are we going to bring about an intelligent school system in this country. By separating the two, we continue this myth of separation, and people continue to say, "Well, you know, sending my boy to vocational education is denying him educational opportunities." If those people would just look at vocational education, there are more doctors of education and vocational education than ever before. No longer is the vocational faculty made up of people who come out of factories to teach young people skills. Vocational education itself is a highly precise science today, and you as vocational educators have no one to apologize to, and you don't have to take a back seat. You know, I sound like that evangelist who got so carried away with his subject that when he got all through he said to his congregation, "All right, brothers and sisters, those of you who want to go to heaven, raise up your right hand." And the whole congregation raised their hands, except one. And he said, "Brother John, what about you?" Brother John said, "Well, preacher, the way you're preaching you sound like you are fixin' to take up that load to heaven tonight, and I am not quite ready to go." Well, I don't want to take you up to heaven, but I do want to show you there are fantastic opportunities. No segment of our entire society of 203 million has a greater responsibility and a greater opportunity than those of you in this room, but you are

going to have to be bold, to stand up. Those who have fought back, who have stymied these programs, are going to have to give way. They are going to have to realize that the time has come for Congress to be responsive. You have never had more friends than you have now in Congress in vocational education. The question is what you will do with them. I hope that in the next few days this conference will put into a sharper perspective what you as individuals can do in righting the American educational system and making it the best in the world. Thank you very much!

REPORTS IN THE
CAREER AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERIES

1. Coster, John K. **The Development of a Vocational-Technical Education Personnel Development Program in a State**

2. Coster, John K., and Nicholas L. Paul. **Seminar for Developing State Programs for Vocational Education Professional Personnel**

3. Coster, John K., and Sue J. King. **Conference of Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators**

4. Drewes, Donald W. **A Planning System for the Implementation of Section 553, Education Professions Development Act, in State Agencies for Vocational Education.**

5. Klein, Gerald. **A Suggested Procedure for Preparing Budget Notes and Contractual Agreements for Projects Funded Under EPDA, Part F** OUT OF PRINT

6. Shook, Mollie W., editor. **A Preliminary Survey of Professional Development Programs Funded Under Section 553, Education Professions Development Act**

7. Shook, Mollie W. **The Impact of Vocational Education Professional Development**

8. Robb, Felix C. **Education—1985**

9. Klein, Gerald. **State-Level Management Techniques and Procedures for Implementing Projects Under EPDA, Part F, Section 553**

10. Pucinski, Roman. **Everything You Always Wanted to Know About the National Legislature but . . .**